



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/357,593	07/20/1999	NEIL Y. IWAMOTO	36J.P227	9444

5514 7590 07/15/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
----------

RAHIMI, IRAJ A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/357,593

Applicant(s)

IWAMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

(Iraj) Alan Rahimi

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 September 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. In papers filed on April 11, 2003, applicant amended claim 5 in a minor way and corrected the abstract. Objection to the abstract was removed and drawings accepted.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. This action is Non-Final.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3, 5-7 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara (US patent 6,543,052) in view of Marino, Jr. et al. (US patent 5,530,758).

Regarding claim 1, Ogasawara discloses a method for the secure printing of print data from a client application residing on a data network to a set top box 10 which has a printer, said set top box residing on a digital cable network which has a cable head end 20 for interfacing said digital cable network to said data network, said method comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2622

generating print data in said client application (column 3, lines 14-23, Ogasawra also teaches in column 2, lines 41-45 that set top box has an external interface such as a printer so data generated by application can be printed);

transmitting, in response to a determination that said secure communication path exists, said print data from said client application to said set top box (column 5, lines 53-65); and

sending said print data from said set top box to said printer for printing (column 3, lines 66-67 and column 4, lines 1-3).

However, Ogasawara does not disclose determining whether a secure communication path exists between said client applications and said set top box. Marino, Jr. et al. discloses in column 5, lines 62-67 that determination is made that secure communication path exists between application and network processor. Ogasawara and Marino are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is communication over Internet. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art, at the time of invention to use secure communication path of Marino with Ogasawara's invention to avoid security violations (e.g. releasing confidential or classified information).

Regarding claim 3, Marino discloses a method according to claim 2, wherein the step for determining whether a secure communication path exists between said client application and said set top box further includes a confirmation through said secure protocol, that said cable head end is a secure location, and a confirmation, through said secure protocol, that said set top box is a secure location (column 6, lines 7-50. Figure 11 shows verification of security levels between various locations.

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 5, Ogasawara does not disclose a method according to Claim 1, wherein the step for transmitting said print data from said client application to said set top box includes said print data, sending said print data from said client application to said cable head end, sending said print data from said cable head end to said set top box, said print data, and sending the print data to said printer for printing (column 3, lines 43-55 and column 4, lines 53-67). However, Marino teaches in column 3, lines 25-27 and column 7, lines 23-31 determines whether a secure link is available for exchanging data with the destination entity before transmitting document. . Ogasawara and Marino are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is communication over Internet. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art, at the time of invention to use secure communication path of Marino with Ogasawara's invention to avoid security violations (e.g. releasing confidential or classified information).

Regarding claim 6, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 3, are applicable.

Regarding claim 7, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 3, are applicable.

Regarding claim 13, Ogasawara discloses an apparatus for the secure printing of print data from a client application residing on a data network to a set top box which has a printer, said set top box residing on a digital cable network which has a cable head end for interfacing said digital cable network to said data network, comprising:

a program memory (local storage 74) for storing process steps executable to perform a method according to any of claims 1 to 12; and

a processor (Web server 72) for executing the process steps stored in said program memory.

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 14, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1, are applicable.

Regarding claim 15, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1, are applicable.

5. Claims 2, 4, 8- 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogasawara (US patent 6,543,052) in view of Marino, Jr. et al. (US patent 5,530,758) and further in view of Smith et al. (US patent 6,385,655).

Regarding claim 2, Ogasawara does not disclose according to Claim 1, wherein the step for determining whether a secure communication path exists between said client application and said set top box includes the use of a secure protocol between said client application and said cable head end, and between said cable head end and said set top box. Smith et al. discloses in column 6, lines 52-56 a low level secure communication protocol such Secure Socket Layer for specifying secure communication. Ogasawara and Smith are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is document delivery of an electronic network. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art, at the time of invention to use Secure Socket Layer as secure protocol to establish secure communication.

Regarding claim 4, Ogasawara does not disclose a method according to Claim 1, wherein the step for transmitting said print data from said client application to said set top box includes sending said print data from said client application to said cable head end in a device-independent format, transforming said print data from said device-independent format to a rasterized format which corresponds to said printer, and then sending said print data in said rasterized format from said cable head end to said set top box for printing on said printer

Art Unit: 2622

(column 4, lines 53-66). Smith et al. teaches using certificate authentication for determining a secure communication (column 20, lines 41-49) and device (platform) independent formatted document such as HTML and PDF (column 4, lines 65-67 and column 5, lines 1-11). Shaffer and Smith et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is data communication in a network environment. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art, at the time of invention to combine data security features of Smith et al. with communication arrangement of Ogasawara to provide a method for securely delivering documents over an electronic network, such as Internet.

Regarding claim 8, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4, are applicable.

Regarding claim 9, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 2, are applicable.

Regarding claim 10, Smith discloses a method according to Claim 2, wherein the step for determining whether a secure communication path exists between said client application and said set top box includes the transmission of at least one certificate from said set top box to said cable head end and the transmission of at least one certificate from said cable head end to said client application (column 20, lines 41-49).

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 11, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1 and 4, are applicable.

Regarding claim 12, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1, 4 and 5, are applicable.

***Other prior art cited***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

Gatto et al. (US patent 5,905,521) discloses a television system hooked up to a network and printer.

Schaffa et al. (US patent 5,973,685) discloses a scheme for the distribution of multimedia follow-up information.

***Contact Information***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to (Iraj) Alan Rahimi whose telephone number is 703-306-3473. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L Coles can be reached on 703-305-4712. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.




Art Unit: 2622

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3800.

AR

AR  
July 10, 2003

  
EDWARD COLES  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600